



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,644	03/30/2001	Andre Litster	3254.2.1	8266

21552 7590 02/10/2006

MADSON & AUSTIN  
GATEWAY TOWER WEST  
SUITE 900  
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/822,644	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LITSTER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lamont M. Spooner	<b>Art Unit</b> 2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-30,33-40 and 60-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 60-71 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments, see remarks filed 11/11/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Atkin in view of Thompson and further in view of Hetherington.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 10, 13-26, 30, and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Thompson et al. (Thompson, 6,275,978).

As per **claims 1, 21 and 40**, Atkin et al teach a system for providing multiple language support for at least one application program, (figures 2-3) the system comprising:

"A plurality of language resource bundles comprising association between languages keys and displayable language sensitive elements, each of said resource bundles corresponding to a different language" (col. 3, lines 36-67, his resource bundle 208 with

different natural languages being supported by different resource bundles that comprises text string with identifiers)

"A language resource manager configured to receive a first language key from an application program, locate a language resource bundle corresponding to a currently-selected language, identify a language sensitive element associated with the first language key, and provide the identified language sensitive element to the application program for display in a graphical user interface" (col. 3, lines 36-67, his language management module is used by the user to select the language in which text strings for user application are to be displayed within the user interface and causes the appropriate resource bundle to be loaded).

It is noted that Atkin et al teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach wherein one association is specific to a particular application. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Thompson who teaches at col. 3, line 38 to col. 4, line 6 wherein at least one of said associations is specific to a particular application program

Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into Aktin the application specific language sensitive elements associated with his language keys (his text and identifiers) to an application as taught Bell because it would provide global and application specific element for translation (C.3.line 58-C.4.line 21).

Atkin et al further teach at least one of said associations is applicable to a plurality of applications (Col. 4, lines 16-42).

As per **claims 2 and 22**, Atkin et al teach an application program configured to provide a language key to the language resource manager, receive a language sensitive

Art Unit: 2654

element from the language resource manager and display the language sensitive element in a graphical user interface" (col. 3, lines 40-56, when a user selects a particular human language for user application , language manager modules causes the appropriate resource bundle to be loaded).

As per **claims 3 and 23**, Atkin et al teach wherein at least one language sensitive element is selected from the group consisting of a text string, an icon, a graphic and a video clip"(col. 3, lines 36-44, user applications includes a number of functional modules with user interfaces including text strings...).

As per **claims 4 and 24**, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manger is further configured to display a language switching mechanism in the graphical user interface for changing the currently selected language in response to user input" (figure 3, col. 4, lines 53 to col. 5, line 40, upon requesting by the user a change in the human language in which the user interface is displayed, the requested language is loaded if it supported by the user application).

As per **claims 5 and 25**, Atkin et al tech wherein the language switching mechanism is selected from the group consisting of drop down list, a menu, a button, an edit box and an icon (col. 4, line 64-66, the user interface text in requested language using for instance a drop down list or a menu is loaded ).

As per **claims 10, 13- 20, 30 and 33-39**, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manager is in communication with a plurality of applications...( His language management module 204).

As per **claims 6 and 26**, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manger is

Art Unit: 2654

further configured to change the currently selected language in response to at least one keystroke (col. 4, lines 57-59, the user requested the language changed using fir instance one keystroke).

5. Claims 7-8 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Thompson as applied to claim 1 and 21 above and further in view of Hetherington (6,469,713).

It is noted that Atkin ('547') teaches a user requested a change in the human language in which the user interface is displayed and if the requested language is supported by the user application , the user interface is loaded, but does not explicitly teach a language switching component configured to receive from the language resource manager a second language sensitive element and replace the first language sensitive element with the second language sensitive element in the graphical user interface. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Hetherington et al who teach a method for dynamic language switching wherein user interface dialogs may reload the contents of displays , updating the user interface display to contain the contents of menu labels, help text in the new human language or display text formatted in accordance with the new cultural convention at he abstract and col. 4, lines 11-65. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the combination (Aktin with Bell) a language switching component as taught by Hetherington because it would enable remote support by users employing different languages, setting user interface display languages based on user preference.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 60-71 are allowed.
7. Claims 9 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - Hetherington (6,339,755) teaches discarding the graphical user interface being currently displayed, generating a new graphical user interface comprising at least one new language-sensitive element indicated by a language resource bundle for a received language key.
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms  
02/03/2006



**RICHEMOND DORVILLE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**